1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

NPT/CONF.1995/MC.III/SR.6
17 May 1995
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

MAIN COMMITTEE III

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6TH MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 5 May 1995, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF MAIN COMMITTEE III

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference and Support Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of this meeting and of other meetings of the Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

95-80943 (E)
9580943

/...

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF MAIN COMMITTEE III (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.III/CRP.4/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN commended the spirit of cooperation and the flexibility shown by all delegations. The text was fair and balanced because the views of all delegations had been taken into account in drafting it. Since the changes that had been made were not substantive, he suggested that the meeting should be suspended for 10 minutes to enable delegations to look closely at the revised text (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.III/CRP.4/Rev.1).

2. It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 11.30 a.m. and resumed at 11.45 a.m.

3. Mr. RAJA ADMAN (Malaysia) proposed that the following words should be added at the end of paragraph 4 of section III: "In this context, the Conference notes with appreciation the contribution of the extrabudgetary funds mechanism in providing additional resources".

4. Mr. NAIMIARFA (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, on direct and explicit instructions from his Government, he wished to propose that the text of paragraph 7 of document NPT/CONF.1995/MC.III/WP.5 should be inserted after paragraph 10 of section III. If his proposal was not adopted, the text should be added in square brackets and referred to the Drafting Committee. While Iran did not want to open a Pandora's box or obstruct the Committee's work, there was some overlapping between the tasks of the Main Committees which would have to be resolved by striking a balance on all the questions under discussion.

5. Mr. RIDER (New Zealand) said that he had thought that all the substantive issues had been resolved in the informal meetings and that all that remained to be done was to make certain technical corrections. He therefore considered it unfortunate that a substantive point was being raised at the present stage. He believed that the final sentence of paragraph 11 of section III addressed Iran's concerns about restrictions on the transfer of nuclear technology and he therefore favoured retaining the current wording, which had the support of all delegations.

6. Mr. ODAGA-JALAMAYO (Uganda) noted that, once again, a difficult situation had arisen. He feared that if the debate on substantive questions was reopened, the end result would be a very different document from the one currently under discussion. The negotiation of a consensus document required that a solution be accepted even if it did not entirely meet the desired objectives. He favoured the inclusion in square brackets of the text proposed by Iran.

7. Mr. TITKOV (Russian Federation) said that the wording of section V posed a number of difficulties and that his delegation, while joining the consensus, reserved the right to raise the issue again at a later stage when it was considered by the Drafting Committee.

8. Mr. STOIBER (United States of America) said that he was deeply disappointed that an issue which he had thought resolved was being raised again at such a late stage in the negotiations. The current wording of paragraph 11 of section III adequately reflected the main thrust of the proposal by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. All States had agreed to make some sort of concession, and one delegation was now trying to reopen the debate and upset the complex balance that had been achieved. He could not agree to the introduction of the proposed text in square brackets, since the Drafting Committee's job was purely stylistic and mechanical.

9. Mr. PATTISON (United Kingdom) said that, thus far, the work done by Main Committee III had been a model of how to conduct complex international negotiations in a constructive spirit of compromise. Documents agreed at the international level were often extremely complex. Paragraph 11 of section III was the result of an extensive search for common ground and that was also the spirit in which delegations should approach the final days of the Conference. He therefore very much regretted that, at that late stage, one delegation had adopted a partisan stance which ruled out the possibility of a solution that was acceptable to everyone. The issue was extremely delicate and complex and, while his delegation understood the concerns that it aroused, he believed that the current wording dealt with them satisfactorily.

10. Mr. ESCOBAL (Argentina) supported the statement made by the representative of New Zealand. He felt that all delegations had made concessions in all the texts and that it was irresponsible at that late stage to reopen issues which had been dealt with earlier. Argentina deferred to the judgement of the Chairman, who had a vital role to play in wrapping up the debate and arriving at balanced texts.

11. Mr. LUCK (Australia) echoed the remarks made by the representative of New Zealand. The results which had been achieved represented a delicate balance, based on a full awareness of the existence of common ground. The delegation which appeared to have upset that balance should therefore desist from reopening issues which had already been dealt with. He considered the report to be a satisfactory outcome. With regard to the remarks made by the Iranian representative, a footnote should be added to paragraph 11 of section III, indicating that amendments might have to be made as a result of the deliberations of other organs of the Conference. That would avoid involving the Drafting Committee in issues which did not necessarily fall within its competence.

12. Mr. NAIMIARFA (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had shown flexibility in the deliberations on the texts, an attitude which had not always been reciprocated by other delegations. He had received precise instructions from his Government and therefore reiterated his proposal. If the paragraph could not be included, he proposed that it should be placed in square brackets and referred to the Drafting Committee.

13. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, since the proposal did not appear to enjoy wide acceptance, paragraph 7 of document NPT/CONF.1995/MC.III/WP.5 should be placed in square brackets and inserted between paragraphs 10 and 11 of section III of the draft report, for submission to the Drafting Committee.

14. It was so decided.

15. Mr. ALVAREZ (Uruguay) said that Uruguay wished to be included in the list of delegations that had submitted document NPT/CONF.1995/MC.III/WP.6.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the text of the draft report should be considered section by section. It was his understanding that the Committee wished to replace the word "on" in paragraph 7 by "to transmit".

17. It was so decided.

Section I

18. Mr. SIERLA (Finland) pointed out that, through an oversight, the original version of the second sentence of paragraph 3 had not been deleted when the text was amended.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the text of section I, as orally revised.

20. It was so decided.

Section II

21. Mr. NWOGUGU (Deputy Secretary) said that the full title of INSAG, which was mentioned in paragraph 2, was International Nuclear Safety Advisory Group. In addition, at the request of the representative of New Zealand, he pointed out that the correct form of the title appearing in paragraph 10 was "IMO Code for the Safe Carriage of Irradiated Nuclear Fuel, Plutonium and High-level Nuclear Radioactive Wastes in Flasks on Board Ships".

22. Ms. CLAEYS (Belgium) said that paragraph 13 of subsection (b) should be placed immediately after paragraph 8 of subsection (a).

23. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the text of section II, as orally revised.

24. It was so decided.

Section III

25. Mr. TATAH (Algeria), referring to the sentence which the representative of Malaysia had proposed adding at the end of paragraph 4 of section III, proposed, in turn and following consultations with the representative of Malaysia, that the addition should read: "In this context, the Conference notes the potential contribution that extrabudgetary mechanisms may have in providing additional resources."

26. Mr. WHANNOY (Benin) asked why the original proposal had been toned down to what was, in his opinion, a less interesting formulation.

27. Mr. TATAH (Algeria) said that, in recent years, a number of Algerian projects had failed to obtain sponsors or funding. The mechanisms in question were important and should be strengthened to ensure funding by sponsors. Algeria appreciated the potential contribution mentioned in the proposed amendment, but considered the present state of affairs unsatisfactory.

28. Mr. WHANNOY (Benin) said that he understood Algeria's concern, but felt that the text proposed by Malaysia did not make a categorical statement. All it said was that the Technical Cooperation Fund could make a contribution to technical cooperation activities and would continue to do so. Algeria, however, felt that the Fund had not done enough. He hoped that an intermediate solution might be found which would reconcile the two positions.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the observations made by the representative of Benin would be duly noted. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted section III, as orally amended.

30. It was so decided.

Sections IV and VI

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted sections IV and VI.

32. It was so decided.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the draft report as a whole, including the paragraph in square brackets and the oral amendment and revisions.

34. It was so decided.

CONCLUSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

35. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN announced that Main Committee III of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had concluded its work.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.